

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, if anyone out there was worried that the Republican leadership of the House was straying from their extremist agenda, fear not, because the budget resolution coming to the House floor today is as extreme as they come.

First and foremost, the Republican budget resolution fails to protect Social Security, but it does not stop there. The budget resolution also cuts funding to educate our children, protect our environment, and provide adequate health care for working American families.

What is really upsetting about this Republican budget resolution is that these extreme cuts are not done in the name of fiscal responsibility or debt reduction. No, instead what Speaker Gingrich and the Republican leadership want to do is provide more tax breaks for the wealthy at the expense of American seniors, kids and working families.

The Republican budget resolution clearly demonstrates that the Speaker's priorities lay somewhere beyond the American working family. The Republican leadership has not learned any lessons since 1995, and we will see today that the Speaker will not even get the support of many of his own House Republicans, much less the American people.

A COMMON SENSE BUDGET

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, only the Democrats would call this budget extremist. Only the Democrats would say taking 1 percent out of a \$9 trillion spending spree by this government actually designed by them is extremist, one penny out of \$1.

The Kasich budget is a common sense document that mandates a smarter, more efficient government. It says that we in Washington should spend a little less so that the American working family can spend a little more to help them achieve their dreams.

Some Democrats find this burden to be unbearable. They say that we will not be able to find the savings. They say that we are extremist. They say we should not give working families tax relief.

I urge the opponents of this budget to justify their opposition to the American people. Tell them that you cannot save a penny on the dollar. Tell them that they do not deserve tax relief today. I urge my colleagues to support the common sense budget.

AN EXTREME BUDGET

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the proudest moments of this Congress is when Democrats and Republicans, the

Congress and the White House put aside their partisan differences and worked out a balanced budget. It not only balanced the Federal budget and brought us into surplus but has led to a very hot, growing economy.

Now the Republican budget would reject that bipartisan agreement and take us back to the extremism that led to the shutdown of our government. It would mean cuts up to 25 percent, not 1 percent, of many programs that we have in government.

Do not take my word for it. Senator DOMENICI said the Republican budget is a mockery. Senator STEVENS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations said, "I do not think Congress could function."

This is an extreme budget. For the sake of our veterans, for the sake of our students, for the sake of our seniors, for the sake of our taxpayers, let us, in a bipartisan manner, reject this extreme budget.

THE ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 1997

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, Congress wrote a massive energy bill in 1994 called the Energy Policy Act which outlined ways for the United States to address our Nation's vulnerable reliance on foreign oil.

Unfortunately, this statute has already run into trouble. The Department of Energy admits this in its own report to Congress stating, quote, "Despite the many uncertainties, it preliminarily appears that the programs authorized by Congress in EPACT will fall substantially short of the year 2010 goal of 30 percent displacement."

Mr. Speaker, the program does not work. I and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. MCCARTHY) have introduced legislation to address this problem. Our legislation would allow fleet managers to use biodiesel blends to comply with the mandates of EPACT, without tax credits or incentives.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 2568, the Energy Policy Act of 1997.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. KIND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud new parent of a baby boy born to Tawni and myself a week ago last Wednesday. Tawni and Matthew are doing very well at home right now. Matthew's older brother Johnny is also recovering from all the excitement.

I could not think of a better birthday present to give to Matthew and the other children around this country, as we resume debate this week on campaign finance reform, that this United States Congress enacts meaningful

campaign finance reform, reform that starts to get the big money and the influence of money out of this political process so that children like Matthew across the country, who want to grow up and serve in public service, do not have to be either independently wealthy or have to go out and raise a million dollars for the campaign. That, I think, would be a tremendous gift that we can give to the children in this country.

Matthew, happy birthday. I look forward to a very long and happy life as your and Johnny's father.

SUPPORT FOR RESTORATION OF FOOD STAMPS FOR LEGAL U.S. RESIDENTS

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today the House will likely vote on legislation which was passed overwhelmingly by the Senate to restore food stamps to thousands of disabled and elderly U.S. legal residents, as well as families with children, and they have entered this country legally, they pay their taxes and they abide by the law.

Since Congress unfairly ended food stamp benefits to U.S. legal residents, more than 900,000 taxpayers have lost their access to food stamps. Sixty-five percent of those affected are families with children. In my home State of Florida nearly 10 percent of the recipients lost eligibility, and most were families with kids. The funds for food stamps in this bill will only be directed to legal U.S. residents who were here before the benefits were terminated.

It is fitting that this great Nation, which gave these permanent residents a new opportunity, will now lend them a helping hand in their times of need after years of contributing to our country. I urge my colleagues to restore the benefits of food stamps to U.S. legal residents.

□ 1015

VOTE AGAINST THE ISTOOK AMENDMENT

(Mr. EDWARDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDWARDS. Parents, beware, Mr. Speaker. If the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) in the next 5 hours is successful in beginning the process to amend the Bill of Rights for the first time in our Nation's history, public schools across America will begin to look like public airports, where religious groups, cults and fanatics can go to our public school grounds and try to convert small children to their particular religious beliefs.

I do not think the parents of America want to send their children to school to be proselytized. They send their children to school to be educated.

I am grateful, Mr. Speaker, that just outside the halls of this historic Chamber, religious leaders of great faith from all over this country, Baptists, Methodists, Jews, Episcopalians and many other faiths will speak out against the Istook amendment, because they believe as Jefferson and Madison did that the best way to ruin religion is to politicize it. That is what the Istook amendment will do.

I urge parents, people and Members across this body and America to oppose the Istook amendment.

AGAINST MFN STATUS FOR CHINA

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, most Americans know and understand that one's actions speak louder than words, but yesterday the President proposed giving permanent most favored nation trading status to Communist China saying that it was, and I quote, clearly in the best interest of this Nation.

We need to look past these words and check out their actions. It was just 18 months ago that our President said, and I quote, not a single, solitary missile was pointed at American children. We now know that China with the help of this administration has at least 13 nuclear missiles aimed at the United States and our children.

In 1990, China provided Iraq with the chemicals needed for a hydrogen bomb. China supplied Pakistan with a weapons grade plutonium reactor in 1991. Despite China's claim that they were not making any nuclear deals with Iran, China gave Iran a nuclear reactor in 1994. Now we are told that China is the single most important supplier of weapons of mass destruction in the world.

MFN status is supposed to be reserved for our best friends, our allies, the countries we are trying to help. Communist China is not our friend.

VOTE NO ON THE ISTOOK AMENDMENT

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, am I a church member? Yes, I am. Is my church important to me? Absolutely. Do I go to church as often as possible and get the good community that is there for me? Absolutely. Do I want the Federal Government to be involved in my church? No. Do I want the government to prescribe prayer in our schools? No. Today we allow already for Bible groups, individual prayer and campus meetings at our schools. That is absolute. We cannot pretend that is not already possible.

Today we will vote on a resolution that would undermine the first amendment, undermine religious freedom.

Today support Madison and Jefferson and vote for religious freedom and against school sponsored prayer. Do not politicize religion. Vote no on the Istook amendment.

PENTAGON REPORTS NATIONAL SECURITY HARMED BY TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY TO CHINA

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, it does not take a rocket scientist to know that helping Communist China with its rocket technology is not in our national interest.

According to published reports, the Pentagon concluded in a May 1997 report that "national security has been harmed" by the transfer of sensitive computer technology to Communist China's military industrial complex.

Where is that May 1997 Pentagon report, you may ask?

Well, here is another key document, a document with critical information that Congress does not possess and which Congress has been told we will never see.

What has the White House response been about this May 1997 Pentagon report? Denials, explanations?

No. We get silence. Or we get spin. Silence and spin. That is about all the American people get anymore. However, this crisis is about national security. This issue puts every American at risk. This makes the world a more dangerous place to live. It is a very serious issue. We deserve a full report.

BUDGET RESOLUTION DOES NOT ADD UP

(Mr. FAZIO of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, the Senate passed its budget resolution over 2 months ago. Under the rules of the House, we should have passed a budget resolution at least by the 15th of April. So we come to the floor very late today, and one would think at this late date, we would be prepared with a tight, consensus budget. In fact, that is not the case. We have a \$24 billion black hole in this budget resolution the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) will present today. We double count cuts in food stamp administration, we double count cuts in veterans spending. In fact, unless we can find alternatives to using these cuts twice, we will pass a fraudulent budget or end up cutting these programs for more than any of us intend.

The New York Times said of this resolution when it came to the Budget committee that "it fails the basic integrity test and that the House should vote it down, demanding instead a budget that is real, not rigged." I agree, Mr. Speaker. We are not ready,

even at this late date, with the Committee on Appropriations waiting in the wings to deal with a budget resolution that just does not add up. Let us protect Social Security and not spend any of the surplus until we have found a solution to the baby boom bulge and bring the Social Security fund into balance.

SUPPORT THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

(Ms. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, today I want to urge my colleagues to support the 1999 budget resolution. Building on our success in balancing the budget, this plan outlines the next steps to empower families so that they can keep more of their hard-earned money.

By reducing government spending by one penny over 5 years, that is just one-fifth of a penny each year for 5 years out of each dollar, we can improve the quality of life in America in three important ways. First, we can continue to pay down the national debt so that our constituents pay less in interest for loans, and our economy remains strong.

Secondly, we can lower taxes so that Americans keep more of their money to support their families or plan for the future. Today our citizens pay nearly 40 percent from their paycheck each month to support the government. I think that is a very unfair tax burden.

Third, we can protect and modernize the Social Security system that gives Americans from every generation the peace of mind about their retirement years. The Republican approach is a good approach. I urge my colleagues to support it.

THE DEMOCRATIC BUDGET

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the budget. Well, actually two budgets. There is on the one hand the Republican extreme budget, a budget that is irresponsible, a budget that contains a \$24 billion black hole of unspecified cuts, a budget that is weighted once again toward the wealthy. On the other hand, you have the Democratic budget. It is a balanced budget, but it focuses on people.

Why do I object to the Republican budget? First, it fails to protect Social Security. It talks about a better way of life, but the administration and the Democrats have said the first thing we ought to do is put every penny of the surplus toward protecting Social Security. That is the people's budget. That is the Democratic perspective.

Second, the Republican budget fails to invest in education. The thing that is most important for our Nation's future is to invest in education, smaller